

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Attached herewith is one (1) one corrected drawing sheet to be substituted for the corresponding drawing sheet presently on file in the above-identified application. The attached replacement drawing sheet includes the changes to Figure 1. The replacement drawing sheet incorporates the changes required in reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005, and is not believed to add new matter to the original disclosure. More specifically, the changes are as follows:

In Fig. 1, reference characters 2F and 1F are deleted.

Attachments:      Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 14-19, 27, 28 and 31-42 are presented for examination. Claims 7, 20, 29 and 30 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15 and 27 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, and Claims 16-19 have been amended as to matters of form. Claims 31-42 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1, 14, 27, 31, 34, 36, 39, 41 and 42 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested. The canceled claims will not be further addressed herein.

The specification has been amended to conform the Summary of Invention section to the present claims.

In the March 25, 2005 final Office Action, Figure 1 of the drawings was objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because it references characters 2F and 1F, which are not mentioned in the description. Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended Figure 1 to overcome the noted objection by deleting characters 2F and 1F. It is believed that the noted objection to Figure 1 has been remedied, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 14-18, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,553,431 (Yamamoto). Claims 6 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,449 (Arnold).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 14 and 27 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits

that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a multi-functional device connected to a network, and having a plurality of functions including at least a first function and a second function. The device includes: registration means for transmitting information on the function of the multi-functional device to a server apparatus, and registering the information in the server apparatus; generation means for generating information corresponding to a third function realized by combining the first function and second function; and control means for controlling the registration means to register the information generated by the generation means in the server apparatus. The device also includes: reception means for receiving service information provided by another device which includes location information indicating a location of the other device registered in the server apparatus; and determination means for determining whether the other device and the multi-functional device neighbor each other, based on the location of the other device indicated by the location information received by the reception means and a location in which said multi-functional device is placed. The control means controls the registration means to register in the server apparatus information that relates the service information received by the reception means with service information indicating a service that the multi-functional device can provide, if the determination means determines that the other device and the multi-functional device neighbor each other.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 not believed to be taught or suggested by the prior art is (1) reception means for receiving service information provided

by another device which includes location information indicating a location of the other device registered in the server apparatus. Still less does that art suggest either (2) determination means for determining whether the other device and the multi-functional device neighbor each other, based on the location of the other device indicated by the location information received by such reception means and a location in which said multi-functional device is placed; or (3) control means for controlling the registration means to register in the server apparatus information that relates the service information received by such reception means with service information indicating a service that the multi-functional device can provide, if such determination means determines that the other device and the multi-functional device neighbor each other.

Yamamoto relates to a management server for collecting device profile information. Yamamoto discusses a host computer for acquiring device profiles from input and output devices and forming transfer path profiles from selected device profiles of the input and output devices. However, even if the device profiles may include network addresses (see, e.g., Figs. 7, 33, 34 and 37), nothing in Yamamoto teaches or suggests receiving service information provided by another device which includes location information indicating a location of the other device registered in a server apparatus, as recited in Claim 1. As is well known, network addresses do not in general provide information about the location of the unit in question, but only provide an “address” that can be used to identify that unit. Applicant submits that nothing in Yamamoto would teach or suggest the provision, reception or use of location information.

Further, nothing in Yamamoto teaches or suggests determination means

for determining whether the other device and the multi-functional device neighbor each other, based on the location of the other device indicated by such location information received by such reception means and a location in which the multi-functional device itself is placed, as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, nothing in Yamamoto teaches or suggests control means for controlling the registration means to register in the server apparatus information that relates the service information received by the reception means with service information indicating a service that the multi-functional device can provide, if the determination means determines that the other device and the multi-functional device neighbor each other, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is clearly allowable over Yamamoto.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claims 14 and 27 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over Yamamoto for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

New independent Claim 31 is directed to a network device connected to a network, including a reception means and transmission means. The reception means receives service information provided by another device which includes location information indicating a location of the other device registered in a server apparatus. The transmission means transmits the service information received by the reception means and

service information indicating a service that the network device can provide to the server apparatus such that the service information for the other device and the service information for said network device is related with each other and registered in the server apparatus, if the location of the other device indicated by the received location information and a location in which the network device is placed neighbor each other.

Nothing in Yamamoto teaches or suggests transmission means for transmitting the service information received by the reception means and service information indicating a service that the network device can provide to the server apparatus such that the service information for the other device and the service information for the network device is related with each other and registered in the server apparatus, if the location of the other device indicated by the received location information and a location in which the network device is placed neighbor each other, as recited in Claim 31.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 31.

Independent Claims 36 and 41 are method and memory medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 31, and are believed to be patentable over Yamamoto for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 31.

New Claim 34 is directed to a server apparatus that can communicate with a plurality of devices, including a reception means, a retaining means and a transmission means. The reception means receives from each of the plurality of devices location information indicating a location of the device. The retaining means retains the

location information for each of the plurality of devices received by the reception means. The transmission means transmits service information indicating one service that a number of devices among the plurality of devices can provide in cooperation and the location information indicating the location for each of the number of devices based on the information retained by the retaining means.

Applicant submits that nothing in Yamamoto teaches or suggests transmission means for transmitting service information indicating one service that a number of devices among the plurality of devices can provide in cooperation and location information indicating the location for each of the number of devices based on information retained by the retaining means, as recited in Claim 34.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 34.

Independent Claims 39 and 42 are method and memory medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 34, and are believed to be patentable over Yamamoto for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 34.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully

requests early and favorable continued examination of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 508862v1

O I P E  
JUN 30 2005  
JC32  
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appln. No. 09/892,875  
Reply to Office Action  
dated March 25, 2005  
REPLACEMENT SHEET

1 / 6

FIG. 1

